UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,299	03/10/2006	Andreas Hahn	2058.092US1	6243

50400 7590 06/29/2009

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/SAP
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER	
BEYEN, ZEWDU A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2416	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/29/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com
scape@slwip.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/571,299	HAHN, ANDREAS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ZEWDU BEYEN	2416	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 April 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *17* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17, have been examined, and are pending

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/23/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 15 references a computer program that is not embedded within a computer readable medium or other statutory matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

> 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
> 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
> 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
> 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. claims 1, 2, 3,4,6,7,9,10,11,12,14,15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant admitted prior art 'AAPA' (fig.1), in view of Ventura to **(US2003/0110273)** , and further in view of Furukawa to **(US20060036768)**,

Regarding claims 1, 9, 14, 15, and 16, 'AAPA' (fig.1) teaches a computer network system comprising: a plurality of client hardware elements forming a computer network (fig.1 cloud .114); a server network segment comprising a plurality of service (fig.1, cloud 112); and a router for interconnecting the computer network with the server network segment (fig.1

box.116); the computer network being assigned at least one first access address range (fig.1, IP-range 10.x.x.x),

the server network segment being assigned , the at least one third access address range (fig.1, IP-range 10.10.10.x) is a shared address range representing at least a sub-range of the at least one first access address range(fig.1, IP-range 10.10.10.x, in the server segment and the IP-range 10.x.x.x on the computer network segment are shared range), each of the plurality of services being assigned one access address within the shared address range (IP-range 10.10.10.x, in the server segment, each service have separate port number).

Though, 'AAPA' teaches a router with access list, it does not specifically teach where the router routes packets within the shared access address range and blocks packets from the exclusive address range. Furthermore , 'AAPA' also does not specifically teach the server network segment being assigned at least one second access address range, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range.

However, in an analogous art, Ventura teaches a server network segment assigned at least one second access address range, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range ([0011] discloses private IP) separate from the at least one first access address range ([0011] discloses a server communication with private IP and public IP. Where the private IP is used to access exclusive documents that are not accessible by outside parties)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the 'AAPA' by assigning at least one second access address range on the server segment, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range, as suggested by Ventura. This modification would benefit the system of 'AAPA' to improve security.

Furukawa teaches a packet filter employed in an access control apparatus where packets are routed within the shared access address range (i.e. non-private address communication range) and blocked from the exclusive address range (i.e. private address communication range) ([0012]-[0013] discloses packet filleting that blocks communication with private address communication range and allow communication with non-private address communication range)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the 'AAPA' by Including a filtering system to allow packets from the shared access range and to block packets from the exclusive access address range, as suggested by Furukawa. This modification would benefit the system by providing additional security since the private addresses are not known to the external environment (see Furukawa, abstract).

Regarding claims 2, and 10, 'AAPA' (fig.1) teaches a computer network system according to

claim 1, and 9 wherein the access address ranges are Internet Protocol address ranges (fig.1 shows an IP-range).

Regarding claims 3, and 11, 'AAPA' (fig.1) teaches a computer network system according to claim 1, and 9 wherein the server network segment is a LAN server (fig.1 shows a LAN server).

Regarding claims 4, and 12, 'AAPA' (fig.1) teaches a computer network system according to claim 1, and 9 wherein the computer network is a Local Area Network LAN or a Wide Area Network WAN (fig.1 a Local Area computer Network).

Regarding claim 6, 'AAPA' discloses a router for interconnecting a server network segment comprising a plurality of services with a computer network (fig.1, box.116)

the computer network being assigned at least one first access address range (fig.1,IP-range 10.x.x.x),

the server network segment being assigned , the at least one third access address range (fig.1, IP-range 10.10.10.x)is a shared address range representing at least a sub-range of the at least one first access address range(fig.1, IP-range 10.10.10.x, in the server segment and the IP-range 10.x.x.x on the computer network segment are shared range), each of the plurality of services being assigned one access address within the shared address range (IP-range 10.10.10.x, in the server segment, each service have separate port number).

Though, 'AAPA' teaches a router with access list, it does not specifically teach where the router routes packets within the shared access address range and blocks packets from the exclusive address range. Furthermore , 'AAPA' also does not specifically teach the server network segment being assigned at least one second access address range, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range.

However, in an analogous art, Ventura teaches a server network segment assigned at least one second access address range, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range ([0011] discloses private IP) separate from the at least one first access address range ([0011] discloses a server communication with private IP and public IP. Where the private IP is used to access exclusive documents that are not accessible by outside parties)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the 'AAPA' by assigning at least one second access address range on the server segment, wherein the at least one second access address range is an exclusive address range separate from the at least one first access address range, as suggested by Ventura. This modification would benefit the system of 'AAPA' to improve security.

Furukawa teaches a packet filter employed in an access control apparatus where packets are routed within the shared access address range (i.e. non-private address communication

range) and blocked from the exclusive address range (i.e. private address communication range) ([0012]-[0013] discloses packet filleting that blocks communication with private address communication range and allow communication with non-private address communication range)

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the 'AAPA' by Including a filtering system to allow packets from the shared access range and to block packets from the exclusive access address range, as suggested by Furukawa. This modification would benefit the system by providing additional security since the private addresses are not known to the external environment (see Furukawa, abstract).

Regarding claim 7, 'AAPA' teaches a router according to claim 6, the access address ranges are Internet Protocol address ranges (fig.1 shows an IP-range).

7. **Claims 5, 8 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 'AAPA', Ventura and Furukawa as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, in further in view of Lakshman et al. to **(US5951651).**

Regarding claim 5, the combination of AAPA, Ventura , and Furukawa silent on, a computer network system according to claim.1, wherein the router comprises a filter set up to block

addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range.

However, in an analogous art, Lakshman teaches wherein the router comprises a filter set up to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range (fig.2, fig.3,col.3 lns.58-64,and col.4 lns.12-21, disclose a router and filtering rules that can be applied in the router to block or pass packets).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of 'AAPA' by including filter in the router to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range as suggested by Lakshman. This modification would benefit the system by providing a fast destination or source address check up to facilitate a speedy communication.

Regarding claim 8, the combination of AAPA, Ventura , and Furukawa silent on a router according to claim 6, the router comprising a filter which is set up to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range.

However, in an analogous art, Lakshman teaches wherein the router comprises a filter set up to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range(fig.2, fig.3,col.3 lns.58-64,and col.4 lns.12-21, disclose a router and filtering rules that can be applied in the router to block or pass packets).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of 'AAPA' by including filter in the router to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range as suggested by, Lakshman, for the same reasoning the examiner supplied in claim 5 above.

Regarding claim 13, the combination of AAPA, Ventura , and Furukawa silent on a method according to claim 11, further comprising the step of setting up a filter in the router in such a manner that the filter blocks addresses from the second access address range(s) and passes addresses from the third access address range(s).

However, in an analogous art, Lakshman teaches wherein the router comprises a filter set up to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range(fig.2, fig.3,col.3 lns.58-64,and col.4 lns.12-21, disclose a router and filtering rules that can be applied in the router to block or pass packets).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of 'AAPA' by including filter in the router to block addresses from the second access address range and to let pass addresses from the third access address range as suggested by Lakshman, for the same reasoning the examiner supplied in claim 5 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. (See PTO-892).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ZEWDU BEYEN whose telephone number is (571)270-7157. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on 1-571-272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Z. B./

Examiner, Art Unit 2416

/Huy D. Vu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416